

invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

35 U.S.C. § 132 requires that an examiner include in the action reasons for any rejection, objection or requirement. A PTO patent application claim rejection violates 35 U.S.C. § 132 if it “is so uninformative that it prevents the applicant from recognizing and seeking to counter the grounds for rejection.” *Chester v. Miller*, 906 F.2d 1574, 1578, 15USPQ2d 1333, 1337 (Fed. Cir. 1990)

In the Office Action, the Examiner has failed to explicitly show that each and every element as set forth in each of the rejected claims is taught or suggested by the cited reference. Thus, a *prima facie* case for rejection under U.S.C. § 102 (b) has not been made. Consequently, the Applicant is unable to respond to the rejection of these claims. In particular, the Examiner has failed to point out where any element of claims 1-20 are taught or suggested in *Gombrich*. The Examiner has failed to cite any sections of the reference as anticipating the claims, nor indicated where within any section any element of the rejected claims was taught or suggested.

The Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner explicitly specify, for each rejected claim, where each and every element of the claim is taught or suggested by the cited reference.

Respectfully submitted,

**BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul A. Mendonsa  
Reg. No. 42,879

Date: November 19, 2001

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(503) 684-6200